

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FIL	ING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/747,558	12	2/23/2000	Mehmet C. Oz	20076-51	20076-51 5175	
54042	7590	10/25/2005		EXA	EXAMINER	
WOLF, BLO	OCK, SHO	ORR AND SOLIS	WOO, J	WOO, JULIAN W		
250 PARK A	VENUE				<del></del>	
10TH FLOOR				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
NEW YORK	NIX 101	177		0001		

DATE MAILED: 10/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
09/747,558	OZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Julian W. Woo	3731		

	Julian VV. VVOO	3/31	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>30 September 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE T	HIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION	FOR ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or this application, applicant must timely file one of the fol places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliatime periods:	lowing replies: (1) an amendment, a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in Ince with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply n	ffidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) $\square$ The period for reply expires $3$ months from the mailing data			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of thin one event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPER	e later than SIX MONTHS from the maili or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH 9 706.07(f).	ng date of the final rejecti IE FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office lamay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704 NOTICE OF APPEAL	extension and the corresponding amoun the shortened statutory period for reply or to than three months after the mailing d	t of the fee. The appropr ginally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>30 September 2005</u>.         of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37 appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any re AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>	(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 41.37(e)), to avoid	dismissal of the
	a but anion to the data of filing a built	£	
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection         <ul> <li>(a) They raise new issues that would require further</li> <li>(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE be</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	consideration and/or search (see NC		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in tappeal; and/or	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1	.121. See attached Notice of Non-C	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.</li></ol>	(s):		
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	·	·	•
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 37,40-42,44-46,48,49.		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE  8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good a was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filir entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necess</li> </ol>	o overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	eal and/or appellant fai	ls to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explana REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	tion of the status of the claims after	entry is below or attach	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered	but does NOT place the application	in condition for allowar	nce because:
<ul><li>12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s</li><li>13.  Other:</li></ul>	). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper		
		Julian W. Woo Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3731	Mos

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 7-05)

## 7 (b) continued.

Claims 37, 38, 40, 42-44, and 46-48 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yoon (5,620,452). Yoon discloses, in figure 16 and in col. 1, lines 22-58 and col. 3, lines 6-40, and col. 5, lines 48-61, a fastener having a first plate (18), a pair of laterally-spaced apart penetrating elements (40) on the first plate, a second plate (16), a pair of holes (36) on the second plate for receiving the penetrating elements, and a hinge (at 14), where the first plate is free of additional penetrating elements spaced from the pair of laterally-spaced penetrating elements, where the penetrating elements pass entirely through the holes, where the fastener is composed of a biocompatible, non-immunogenic material (e.g., titanium), and where the fastener is adapted to be introduced via a percutaneous, endoscopic approach, where the second plate has an axial and lateral direction, where the first and second plates are joined by a laterally oriented hinge (14) and the axial direction is perpendicular to the hinge. Note: The introductory statement of intended use ("for securing coapted valve leaflets together") has been carefully considered but deemed not to impose any structural limitations on the claims patentably distinguishable over Yoon's device, which is capable of being used as claimed if one desires to do so.

Claims 41, 45, and 49 would be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoon. Yoon discloses the invention substantially as claimed, but does not specify the plate dimensions as claimed. Nevertheless, it would have been a matter of design choice to dimension the plates in the ranges of dimensions as claimed. The choices would be dependent upon the desired size for the fastener and upon the place of application for the fastener.